

It is the duty of every body of men, who hereafter shall address or petition the king for inquiry into the causes of the Convention, to support the City of London.

[705]

TO THE FREEHOLDERS AND INHABITANTS OF HAMPSHIRE.

GENTLEMEN,

Well! we have had our meeting, and I am confident, that, though my wishes did not entirely prevail, our example will have a good effect from one end of the kingdom to the other.

From the circumstance of there being three gentlemen from London, present at the meeting, for the express purpose of taking down and publishing an account of the proceedings, a circumstance at which no one was more surprized than myself, for, I really thought that we were held in too much contempt to be thought worthy of any thing like general attention; from this circumstance, (very pleasing to me, I must confess) I conclude, that nearly the whole of what was said and done at the meeting of yesterday will have been published in the daily newspapers, before that which I am now writing can possibly issue from the press. If this be the case, the report, as so published, will be inserted in this sheet, and, therefore, proceeding upon the opinion that the intended publication will take place, I shall here confine myself to such observations as naturally grow out of the proceedings at the Shire Hall, and as appear to me likely to be useful.

First, Gentlemen, I hope you will, with me, be delighted at the now established fact, that, at a numerous and respectable meeting of our county, called and marshalled by *Noblemen* and *Baronets*, the leaders of a party lately powerful enough to carry the two members for the county; that, at such a meeting, there have appeared one half, at least, of the persons present, ready to support a proposition, coming from one, who neither has nor wishes to have, pretensions to any rank other than that of *Yeoman*; and who came before that meeting unsupported by any interest other than that which grew out of the principles he had proclaimed: at this fact, Gentlemen, I am convinced you will, with me, feel pleasure and pride. As to the effect with regard to myself I am completely indifferent. It was of no consequence who was the *person*. Whether the proposition came from a tall or

a short lump of clay; a lump of fresh or pale, of fair or dark, colour; or whether it was called Cobbett or by any other name; this was of no consequence. It was the *principle*, the vital principle that was of importance. That principle did completely triumph, and in that triumph I see, and I hope you see, a prospect of better days; a prospect of days when this county will not be trampled under foot by men, and particularly one man, who have nothing but what they have derived from the public purse, nothing but what has been squeezed out of the fruits of our labour.

Having spoken of *party*, I think it necessary to say, that I saw no reason whatever to impute party motives, upon this occasion, either to the Earl of Northesk, or to any of the gentlemen who appeared with his lordship; but, on the contrary, it appeared to me, that they were over-anxious to avoid every thing that might have the appearance of proceeding from party motives. The truth is, that, as things stand at present, there would, in a case like this, be *nothing* done, were not those to move, who belong to a party. If, as is the case, the whole, or nearly the whole, of the opulent men in a county be notoriously of one party or the other, those of the opposition party must call for a meeting, in a case like the present, or, it is evident, that there can be no meeting at all. And, therefore, though I did not approve of the Address moved, and finally carried, by Lord Northesk and his friends, they are fairly entitled to my gratitude, and, I think, to the gratitude of the county at large.

The two Addresses will appear in their proper place in the Report, which will be hereunto subjoined; and, Gentlemen, I beg you carefully to compare them with each other, and, when you have so done, let each man put it to his own heart, whether the one, which I had the honour to propose to the meeting, is not that of which he most approves; whether the principles there asserted and the sentiments there expressed, are not the principles and the sentiments that he would (all selfish views aside) wish to see universally prevail. There was one object, upon which I was

very intent; namely, that of giving support to the City of London; and, Gentlemen, though the Address and Petition proposed by me was, at last, not formally carried, the point of decision was so nice, that I hope Mr. Waithman and those who have so nobly supported him will consider, that *this county*, at least, has done its duty. The Address proposed by Lord Northesk was, I myself believed, carried *at last*; but, it was not until after many persons, who came from a distance and who were anxious to get home, had retired under the full persuasion, that the *decision* had taken place in favour of the Address and Petition proposed by me. I dwell upon this point solely for the purpose of showing the City of London what honourable support they had in Hampshire; and, for the same purpose, I add, that, at the reading of those parts of my Address and Petition, which were literally copied from the City Resolution of the 27th of October, the meeting gave particular marks of applause; while (and I challenge a denial of the fact) not one single mark of applause was given, hardly a sound or a movement or a look of satisfaction was perceived, at the reading of the cold and courtly Address which contended for the preference. No, Gentlemen, this Address did not speak the language of your hearts. It did not convey to the throne an expression of the feelings of a people sensible that they have made sacrifices unparalleled, and that those sacrifices have only furnished the means of purchasing national dishonour; the feelings of a people disappointed and insulted; the feelings of a people, who, for their liberality and long-enduring patience, have been paid with new burthens and with unprecedented scorn. No: this Address did not express those feelings; and, my decided opinion is, that, when the noble lord and the gentlemen, who proposed and supported it, shall have taken time to re-peruse and re-consider, they will feel great sorrow, not, I hope, unmixed with some degree of shame, that, for the sake of an Address such as this, they rejected that which was proposed by me, and which, as they *could not fail to perceive*, had the *hearts* of all, while theirs had only the *voices* of a part, of the meeting.

Upon the subject of the vast sums received out of the public money by Mr. Garnier of Wickham, as salary and profits of *Apothecary General to the Army*, though as the Committee of the House of Commons state, he resides in the country and meddles not with the business; upon this subject I think it right to state, that, as we were leaving the

Hall, a gentleman, upon whose word I rely with confidence, assured me, *that Mr. Garnier wished anxiously for peace*. It is very hard for one man to know the heart of another; but, considering the character of my informant, I believe the fact; that is to say, I believe, that, in this particular case, sentiments of humanity prevail over interest. I do not state this merely as an argumentative admission: I *really believe* the fact. But, Gentlemen, what has this singular and accidental fact to do with what I had the honour to submit to you upon the subject? I made no *assertion* as to Mr. Garnier's feelings. It was a conclusion, which I drew from undeniable premises. I stated the fact, that the amount of this gentleman's revenue was in proportion to the magnitude of the army and to the number of wounds in that army; that, therefore, it was *natural to suppose*, that such a person must wish for a long continuation of the war; and, I am not at all afraid to leave this argument in the hands of the public. I told the meeting, that it was in my power to give a very long list of persons so situated, my object being to explain the mystery why so many people had been found, in some places, to oppose an application for inquiry into a transaction so clearly calculated to lengthen the duration of the war; to give such list there was not time; I was obliged to confine myself to a particular instance; and that of Mr. Garnier was selected, 1st, because it was a striking one; 2nd, because it was a case which derived additional interest from our knowledge of the person; and 3rd, because there was no doubt of some of his friends being present to say whatever could be said in answer. I should, in print, have pointed out this flagrant case, long ago; but, locally, Mr. Garnier was a very near neighbour; and, I felt reluctant to make so near a neighbour a subject in the Register. There was, indeed, no solid reason for this; but, I thought, that some persons might think that I took advantage of my great means of publicity to assail my neighbour. Sometime or other a sense of public duty would have overcome this consideration; but, having an opportunity to state the fact, in a meeting of the county, where I was pretty certain would be, and where I saw, many of the friends and relations of Mr. Garnier, that opportunity was not to be neglected.

—Now, Gentlemen, though we believe, that, contrary to the conclusion that I drew, Mr. Garnier does wish *for peace*, I beg leave to remind you, that Mr. Garnier and his family, who are neither few in number nor weak in means, have,

as I am  
upon all  
day. Thi  
ville and  
Garnier f  
great ze  
thwaite,  
took place  
nistry, th  
ported Sir  
against w  
exertions  
before.  
must see  
must obe  
though, a  
be liable  
where the  
minister l  
one mean  
thing; an  
account l  
minister,  
and corre  
of embar  
ting him.  
money is  
The mon  
and, nex  
join the  
heavier b  
time, in  
the peop  
minutely  
have see  
out of t  
These tw  
unless t  
locked u  
influen  
and exp  
amongst  
steward  
men of  
times ex  
the day  
that the  
nistry o  
the am  
in other  
the pub  
fluence  
ings, to  
togethe  
Gent  
democr  
Gentle  
The la  
mory,  
our po  
this so



as I am credibly informed, *always* voted, upon *all* occasions, for the *ministry of the day*. This I know, that, while Lord Grenville and his colleagues were in power, the Garnier family supported, and that too with great zeal, Messrs. Herbert and Thistlethwaite, and that, when the dissolution took place upon the turning out of that ministry, the Garnier family as zealously supported Sir Henry Mildmay and Mr. Chute, against whom they had used such strenuous exertions only about eight or nine months before. The fact is, Gentlemen, and you must see it clearly, that persons so situated must obey whomsoever is minister; for, though, as in this case, the place may not be liable to be actually taken away; yet, where the amount is not precisely fixed, the minister has it in his power to render it, by one means or another, worth little or nothing; and, in all cases where a man has to *account* he is wholly in the power of the minister, though his accounts should be fair and correct, the latter having so many means of embarrassing and worrying and persecuting him. So that, you see, the loss of the money is not the only, nor is it the least evil. The money is lost to us in the first place, and, next, it makes part of our countrymen join the minister in support of his imposing heavier burdens on us, or, as at the present time, in an endeavour to stifle the voice of the people. Let us trace this a little more minutely. Mr. Garnier receives, as you have seen, twelve thousand pounds a year out of the taxes, raised upon the nation. These twelve thousand pounds a year must, unless they be buried under ground, or locked up in a chest, produce a proportionate influence. The depositing and employing and expending them creates an influence amongst all descriptions of persons: bankers, stewards, farmers, timber merchants, tradesmen of all sorts. This influence is at all times exercised in behalf of the minister of the day; and, therefore, it inevitably follows, that the greatness of the power of the ministry of the day, is in exact proportion to the amount of what we pay in taxes; or, in other words, that, from the moment that the public treasure becomes a source of influence at elections and other public meetings, *taxation* and *absolute power* grow up together like the bark and wood.

Gentlemen, I know, that this is termed *democratical* and *jacobinical* talk. Alas! Gentlemen, these words have done wonders. The late minister, Pitt, of wasteful memory, drew millions upon millions out of our pockets by the help of a few words of this sort. I dare say, that there will not be

wanting persons to charge me with *disloyalty*, because I wish the Portugal generals to be tried, and because I object to Mr. Garnier's receiving twelve thousand a year out of the taxes for doing nothing. It has, Gentlemen, been the constant practice of those, who live upon the public money, to answer their accusers, not by showing, or attempting to show, that they merited the money they received out of the taxes, but by charges of disloyalty. Tell one of them that he wallows in luxury at the expence of a hard-working and half-starved people: his answer is, that you wish to *overturn the government*; for, you will always perceive, that, with this tribe, *government* and *impunity for public plundering* means the same thing. Just as if you must necessarily be a traitor, because your temper will not permit you to see your money taken away, without inquiring a little what is done with it! But, Gentlemen, when an opportunity serves, let us take care that no answer of this sort shall have its intended effect; let us not waste our breath in refusing the charge of high treason, but continue to urge our accusation, reserving our own defence till a defence has been made by those whom we shall accuse. Talk as long as we will, *here* is the root of the evil. The public money, the money paid by the people in taxes, do, and will, 'till a constitutional reform take place, operate in a way to deprive the people of their spirit, and, of course, of their rights. But, Gentlemen, because to effect this reform is difficult; because we do not, at once, clearly perceive the grounds of a hope of accomplishing it, let us not, therefore, say, that the thing is out of our power. Every thing almost, from which any advantage, public or private, is to arise, appears difficult *at first*; but, when once we heartily set about it, the difficulties, however great and numerous, soon appear less both in number and in magnitude. What we want is *public virtue*. Possessed of that, every thing, which reason bids us wish to attain, would be soon in our power. But, that is indispensable. Men must come with their hands clean and their minds perfectly independent; that is to say, perfectly free from *selfish views*, or they will do nothing good. We are seduced into degradation; and a great additional mortification, is, that we are seduced with our own money. We are the slaves of that gold, which we ourselves have earned with the sweat of our brow. Gentlemen, my sincere opinion is, that nothing can preserve this country from becoming a conquest of France, but a con-



stitutional reform of the abuses, which now notoriously exist, and some of which I had the honour to point out to the meeting yesterday. The manner, in which the meeting received my statement; the hearty welcome which was given to sound principles and home truths, expressed in direct and plain terms, encourages me to hope, that the breasts and minds of my countrymen will, as those of their fathers were, yet be found to be the seat of courage and of sense; and, that the day is much less distant than the corruptors and the corrupted imagine, when a proper exertion of these will produce its natural effects.

I remain,

Gentlemen,

Your friend

WM. COBBETT.

*Winchester, 3d Nov. 1808.*

### HAMPSHIRE MEETING.

#### THE CONVENTION OF CINTRA.

On Wednesday, the 2d instant, pursuant to a public requisition, the High Sheriff, George Hanbury Mitchell, Esq. convened a Meeting of the nobility, gentry, freeholders, and inhabitants of the county of Southampton, at the Castle of Winchester, for the purpose of taking into their consideration the propriety of addressing his majesty upon the subject of the Convention of Cintra. The meeting was numerous and highly respectable. The High Sheriff having taken the chair,

Lord NORTHESK presented himself to the attention of the meeting, for the purpose of proposing a Resolution. He hoped that on a subject involving deeply the character and interests of the country, it would not be deemed a presumption in him to offer to their consideration a motion, expressive of the wishes of the county of Hants, to request a full Inquiry into the causes which led to that disgraceful event, the Convention of Cintra. After these prefatory remarks, his lordship proposed the following Resolution:

*“ Resolved, That an humble and dutiful  
“ Address and Petition be presented to his  
“ majesty, expressing our grief and regret at  
“ the Convention lately entered into by the  
“ commanders of his majesty’s forces in Por-  
“ tugal, and the commander of the French  
“ army in Lisbon, praying his majesty to  
“ institute such full, public, and effectual  
“ Inquiry into this transaction, as will lead  
“ to the discovery of all those causes which  
“ produced an event so injurious to the ho-  
“ nour of this country, and the interest of  
“ its allies.”*

Mr. COBBETT then rose and spoke to the

following effect:—“ Mr. High Sheriff; so far from disapproving of any part of the Resolution which has just now been read, I have to state, that I heartily approve of every word of it. I have, however, a proposition to submit to the meeting, which I hope, although coming from a person of so little consequence as myself, will meet with the approbation of this meeting. It will embrace the object of this Resolution, while it will go farther, but yet, I hope, not too far. As to the merits or demerits of the Convention, I think that is a question pretty nearly set at rest; for I have never heard from the lips of any of those who are hostile to a Petition or Address to his Majesty for an Inquiry, any argument in justification of that Convention. It has been urged, that any petition for inquiry is unnecessary. Who told us so? From whence is his majesty to receive such a request but from his people? We are told that he has already given an answer to the Petition of the citizens of London, informing them that a due inquiry will be instituted. He has not given any such answer to us, the inhabitants of Hampshire—(hear! hear! hear!) When they tell us that we ought not to present a Petition, because the city of London has received an Answer (of which I shall hereafter speak more in detail), they do not tell us that that Answer was satisfactory. So far from it, we know that the Common Council have expressly declared that it is not satisfactory, but that it was an ungracious Answer, and, as such, it is entered upon their Journals. Therefore, if we have received an Answer through the city of London, it is an unsatisfactory answer—(Applauses). So that if the Answer to the city of London be adduced as a reason against our proceeding, we have the authority of that city itself, for considering that Answer unsatisfactory—(Applauses). This, Gentlemen, is almost the first time of my addressing a public assembly; and I only intend to present to you a few plain facts, such as my neighbours ought to know—neighbours, whom I am proud to acknowledge, and from whose public spirit I entertain considerable hopes, notwithstanding the treatment they have heretofore experienced—notwithstanding the time and manner in which they have been trodden down (Applauses).—We know, Gentlemen, that Sir Arthur Wellesley, one of the commanders upon the occasion which has called us together, is also one of his Majesty’s ministers; and we are told, that which it is very natural to suspect, that those ministers are anxious to screen him. In speaking of the conduct of ministers upon this occasion, and particularly of

the King  
beg to  
minister  
his Maj  
guard a  
In my o  
Majesty  
screen S  
this det  
first pla  
disgrace  
the com  
when at  
nication  
try, in v  
part wh  
which,  
whole;  
signed l  
lished in  
bours do  
bid that  
They do  
terms “  
Bain.”  
the con  
remained  
son is ob  
proof en  
that ma  
object o  
lesley,  
powerfu  
minance  
any des  
achieve  
dians, j  
sheep.  
lesley h  
ship for  
one tho  
ten thou  
two of  
sheep o  
plauses.  
mander  
he be n  
that in  
distrib  
public r  
in whic  
friend.  
me, and  
the sala  
Wellesl  
officer o  
secretar  
as colon  
him fro  
a gener  
the em



713]

the King's Answer to the city of London, I beg to be understood as alluding solely to ministers—not at all meaning to implicate his Majesty. This I premise, in order to guard against mistake or misconstruction. In my opinion, it is quite evident, that his Majesty's ministers are fully determined to screen Sir Arthur Wellesley. The proofs of this determination are manifest. In the first place, when the news arrived of the disgraceful Convention, ministers withheld the communication as long as possible, and when at last obliged to make the communication to the abused people of this country, in what manner did they do it? That part which it was most material to know; which, in fact, formed the basis of the whole; namely, the Armistice which was signed by Sir Arthur Wellesley, was published in the French language. My neighbours do not understand French. God forbid that they ever should! (*Applauses*) They do not understand the meaning of the terms "*Duc d'Abrantes*," nor "*Chevalier du Bain*." Why did ministers give this part of the communication in French, while the remainder was given in English? The reason is obvious. And in this act alone I see proof enough of their determination to screen that man. (*Applauses*.) Now, as to the object of their preference. Sir Arthur Wellesley, it is well known, is allied to a powerful family, which has risen to predominance, not by great or useful talents of any description, not by eminent or laudable achievements, but by beating the poor Indians, just as a dog would hunt a flock of sheep. Why, Gentlemen, Sir Arthur Wellesley has no claim to the merit of generalship for his boasted victories in India; for one thousand English soldiers would beat ten thousand Indians, with as much ease as two of your dogs would drive a flock of sheep out of a pinfold. (*Laughter and applauses*.) I wish, Gentlemen, that this commander was here to hear me; but, although he be not present, there can be no doubt that in a country where the minister has the distribution of seventy millions a year of the public money, there is scarcely a foot of it in which their favourite will not find a friend. Let any such friend now answer me, and correct me if I am wrong, in stating the salaries and the services of Sir Arthur Wellesley. Before he left this country, that officer enjoyed a salary of £6566 as chief secretary of state in Ireland, besides his pay as colonel of a regiment. Ministers take him from that office and send him abroad as a general; still leaving him in possession of the emoluments of his secretaryship in Ire-

land, although it was impossible for him to execute its duties. Whence this extraordinary partiality? Why, because the Wellesley family have no less than twelve votes in the House of Commons. (*Applauses*.)—What is the next step of ministerial partiality towards this commander? No blame was imputed to him. No idea of trying him was even insinuated. He was not, in fact, recalled from the army, but allowed to come home upon leave of absence.—And here let me remark, that although one of the pleas or apologies for concluding this infamous Convention was, that it would enable our army to march more expeditiously to the aid of the Spaniards; yet, when they were so enabled, their commander, Wellesley, came home, and left the army to go by itself. He came home before the other commanders, in order to tell the first story—in order to have an undue advantage over his colleagues.—Then, what is done upon his arrival? He is introduced at the king's levee; and on the very day, too, that the corporation of London present their Address. Look at the contrast between the treatment experienced by that corporation, and the reception of Sir Arthur Wellesley! Although there were divers great persons at that levee; although there was a bishop and a judge among the circle, Sir Arthur Wellesley was the first person presented to his majesty: and most graciously was he received! But further still. After being thus cordially treated by his majesty, Sir Arthur is sent to resume his office in Ireland, for which, as I have already observed, he has been all along in the receipt of £6,566 a year. Does this imply any inclination to subject Sir Arthur Wellesley to censure, or to bring him to trial? Quite the contrary. And my firm belief is, that in order to screen that commander, ministers will use their endeavours to screen his colleagues; from a just apprehension, that if these colleagues are brought to trial, they would probably impeach Wellesley. For these reasons, ministers may well be suspected, of a determination to prevent any thing like effectual inquiry. (*Loud applauses*.)—But, Gentlemen, you cannot help being surprised, that ministers should have thought it proper to employ Sir Arthur Wellesley at all, upon this occasion, when they had such a number of generals, from among whom they could select a commander. What was the necessity, then, for sending out that officer? Why, Gentlemen, we have at this moment, a Staff consisting of no less than 291 generals. What a boast! (*A laugh*.) The French have not half so many. Among



the dethronement of that king; another, the appointment of a successor; and a third, the passing of a positive law, enacting and establishing the right of the subject to petition. This right was declared, claimed, asserted, and enacted, by an act passed in the reign of William and Mary. The house of lords being assembled, first drew up a Declaration of the crimes of king James, stating, that he had "endeavoured to subvert and extirpate the laws and liberties of this kingdom; first, by assuming illegal powers;" and second, "by committing and prosecuting divers worthy prelates, for humbly petitioning to be excused from concurring to the said assumed powers." We know, from history, that they afterwards declared what their rights and liberties should be hereafter. They claimed, demanded, and insisted upon them, as the sole condition upon which they would acknowledge William and Mary; and one of them was this: "*That it is the Right of the subject to petition the King.*" This is one amongst the express conditions upon which the present king's family were called to the throne. They bargained, not only for the preserving of those rights from violation, but from all attempts upon them. Such is the language of the constitution and law of England, and upon this strong ground it is, that I submit to you, Gentlemen, the following Address:

TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

*"The humble Address and Petition of the Nobility, Gentry, Clergy, Freeholders, and Inhabitants of the County of Southampton."*

*"We, your majesty's most dutiful subjects, the nobility, gentry, clergy, freeholders, and inhabitants of the county of Southampton, humbly approach your majesty with an expression of our deep regret at the Convention lately entered into by the commanders of your majesty's forces and the commander of the French forces in Portugal, a Convention which we deem disgraceful to your majesty's arms, greatly injurious to the interest of this nation, and still more injurious to the interests and the glorious cause of your majesty's faithful allies, now engaged in a perilous conflict for the recovery and preservation of their rights and liberties.—Mindful that at the happy period when those laws were made, by which your majesty's family was placed upon the throne of this kingdom, it was claimed, demanded, and insisted upon, solemnly assented to, and legally enacted, that it was the right of the subject to petition the king; and fully convinced that it is of the utmost impor-*

*tance to the preservation of our liberties, that this right should at all times be freely exercised in all matters of public grievance, without obstruction or reproof, we humbly pray that your majesty will be graciously pleased to institute such an Inquiry relative to the said Convention, as will secure a full and open developement of the real causes of a transaction, which has brought so foul a stain upon the honour of our country, and has rendered unavailing the valour of your majesty's troops, and the vast pecuniary sacrifices of your faithful, heavily turdened, and patient people. And this application to the justice and paternal care of your majesty we deem the more necessary at this time, because, during the eventual period of the last fifteen years, various enterprises and expeditions have been undertaken, in which the character of the country and the honour of your majesty's arms were concerned, which have grievously failed and disappointed the hopes and expectations of the nation, and into which due inquiry has not been made."*

The Rev. Mr. BAKER seconded this Amendment; by saying, that he would not do it if he did not conceive that every honest Englishman should heartily concur in it.

The Rev. Mr. POULTER next offered himself to the meeting—"Mr. High Sheriff and Gentlemen, I rise for the purpose of replying to some of the observations which have fallen from the individual who has last addressed you. In doing so I feel it my duty to limit myself to that part of his arguments which are applicable to the subject for which we are convened, and which shall serve to lead to the question before us. Much stress has been laid upon the Answer which the corporation of the City of London has received from his majesty.—An endeavour has been made to prove, that it gave no positive promise of an acquiescence in the object sought by the address of that corporation. I contend for the contrary; and feeling as I do, that his majesty's Answer on that point was complete, explicit, and satisfactory—(No! No! No!)—This being my opinion, I am not bound to refer to the other part of that Answer, which was alone applicable to the true spirit of the Address. In that Address was introduced extraneous matter, in my mind in an ill-advised, intemperate, and indiscreet manner. To the address just read, there is, I confess, no such objection, inasmuch as it limits its prayer to investigation, and prays for justice alone. There is no call for punishment before investigation is instituted, as in the Address from the Citizens of

London  
zens bel  
cessity o  
the high  
ed to us  
institute  
event  
expecta  
a mome  
not tak  
sembly  
to obta  
myself.  
me, I  
that poi  
cation t  
dy prom  
tionable  
abstain  
no unju  
jesty's  
or in t  
call upo  
coming  
reliance  
in the c  
that it  
written  
citly pr  
move a  
possess  
if I am  
society  
unqual  
brande  
duplic  
quiry i  
to com  
in the  
this in  
rity, th  
yet fro  
and ho  
minist  
name i  
In obe  
will n  
premis  
nectio  
them.  
have a  
Mr.  
mixed  
ceed  
the ge  
culiar  
coinci  
from  
ful an  
gratifi  
I am



London. But, with the answer to these Citizens before the country, let me ask the necessity of petitioning at all? Have we not the highest authority in the kingdom pledged to us, that an inquiry will be promptly instituted into the causes which led to an event "that has disappointed the hopes and expectations of the country?" Could I for a moment believe that such an inquiry would not take place, there is no man in this assembly who would exert his utmost efforts to obtain that object more willingly than myself.—But, with the king's Answer before me, I must declare that I am satisfied on that point, and, therefore, think any application to the throne, for that which is already promised, quite unnecessary, and objectionable. In calling upon this meeting to abstain from an unnecessary address, I repose no unjustifiable confidence in either his majesty's Answer to the corporation of London, or in the sincerity of his ministers; but I call upon you to grant to a public instrument coming from such high authority, the same reliance as you are in the habit of observing in the ordinary intercourse of life. I know that it has been asserted, and I have seen it written, that this instrument does not explicitly promise investigation. In order to remove all doubts upon that point, I am in possession of a fact which must be believed, if I am entitled to the common credence of society: I therefore declare, in the most unqualified manner, and am contented to be branded with the character of falsehood and duplicity if it prove otherwise, that an inquiry is not only determined upon and about to commence, but that it will be carried on in the most open and public manner. For this information, I have the highest authority, though not from one of the cabinet, yet from a gentleman closely connected with and holding a confidential office in, the administration.—This authority I am ready to name if called upon. (*Name, name, name!*) In obedience to the wishes of this meeting, I will name my authority, but beg leave to premise, that with ministers I have no connection whatever, although much attached to them. I am indebted for the fact to which I have alluded to my friend and neighbour Mr. Sturges Bourne (*Loud laughter, mixed with disapprobation*). I now proceed to observe on a part of the speech of the gentleman who preceded me, with peculiar satisfaction; because I there fully coincide in his opinion. Indeed, to differ from a man of undoubted talents, a powerful and argumentative writer, is not the most gratifying occurrence.—Those great qualities I am always ready to attribute to him (Mr.

Cobbett), although it has been my lot to have smarted under their application. (*Hear! hear!*) I only ask in return the same right to form my own opinion, which he claims for himself, and, when necessary, to assert it manfully and without constraint. That the right to petition our sovereign is a great paramount privilege, secured by law to the subjects of this country, is what I trust no man will ever presume to deny. Were that birthright of Britons invaded, most cheerfully would I shed the last drop of my blood to recover and to re-assert it. But, although there can be no question as to the right, there may be a question as to the expediency of exercising it. It is because I deem its exercise at present inexpedient, that I oppose the resolution of the noble lord, and the Address of the last speaker.—And, let it be remembered, that if ever there was a part of the royal prerogative which the constitution of this kingdom treats with most delicacy, it is that very part which the proposed Address calls in question, namely, the conclusion of treaties and conventions and the appointment of officers. If inclined, I could also speculate, as the friends to petitioning have done, on the specific relation and general tendency of this Convention, which has been so much reprobated. But so enamoured am I of fair and public investigation, that I will abstain from hypothetical statements, and commit the developement of the facts to that military tribunal, which is the only one now legally competent to come to a fair decision upon such a case. Should there, from such developement, appear circumstances which affect the responsibility of his majesty's advisers, there is no doubt but that the zeal of party, and indeed of every member of the legislature, will institute, with respect to them, the fullest parliamentary investigation.—The last speaker has attempted to impeach the character of general Sir Arthur Wellesley. On that point I put myself in direct opposition to him (Mr. Cobbett). Whether that distinguished officer fills his civil situation in Ireland with advantage to the public I shall not stop to inquire. I am not in possession of any means to form an opinion upon that subject. I am confident that it stands as high at home, as in the country where he has been so gallantly serving. If it should stand rather higher in Portugal, it is because, amongst his brave companions in arms, his character is so respected and established that nothing in the shape of charge or even insinuation has ever presumed to approach it. (*Hear! Hear!*) Ask any one of that brave army where general Sir A. Wellesley was to



be found on the day of the battle, and the answer will be, "in the hottest of the fight." (*Hear! Hear!*) In reviewing the conduct of any individual, common justice enjoins us not to anticipate guilt, nor to subject our judgments to the influence of prejudice. And surely if ever there was a body more entitled, not alone to the benefits of impartiality, not alone to your protection from prejudgment, but even to your indulgence, they are those military and naval men who brave every danger, submit to every privation, and are continually risking their lives for the defence of your interests, and the advancement of your prosperity and glory. —(*Hear! Hear!*)—Should it unfortunately happen, that a disgraceful event should occur, such as has taken place under general Dalrymple,—(*Not fair*, exclaimed Mr. Baker, *to accuse one officer, in order to screen the other.*) I do not accuse, but call upon you to forbear from being influenced by your prejudices, and to wait until you know the result of the inquiry which has been instituted. With respect to the state of this country, I will say but little. I admit that every possible check ought to be given to the progress of corruption. In fact that destructive stalking horse, and I do believe, that reform is in a course of proceeding—(*A laugh. No! No! No!*) I do deprecate any factious attempt to alienate the people at this peculiar crisis from the executive government; for our safety must depend upon our union: united we cannot fall, and divided we cannot stand. I therefore feel it my duty to propose as an Amendment to the Resolution proposed by the noble lord, not an adjournment, but a motion to this effect, That notwithstanding the disappointment experienced throughout the country in consequence of the late Convention, yet, that his majesty having already pledged himself to institute an Inquiry, it is expedient on the part of the people to forbear any further interference until the result of such inquiry be known.

Mr. PORTALL.—"Gentlemen, since the Resolution was proposed by the noble lord, an Amendment has been submitted, directly contrary to the tendency and object of the former. The grounds upon which this amendment stands are, that our Address is unnecessary—and next, that by our interference we are guilty of prejudging. To such a conclusion I never can subscribe; because I am impressed irresistibly with the propriety of expressing to our sovereign our deep regret that this disgraceful Convention should ever have taken place; and next, that the causes which led to this stain upon

our character should be fully and openly developed. What! if a foul murder be committed, do we not call it murder? We certainly do: and shall we be subjected to the imputation of prejudging, because we reprobate a Convention which all admit to be disgraceful to the British name, and prejudicial to the interest of our allies? Can any man who views the whole, or any part of this transaction, deny that it does fully merit all the reprobation which it has received? We first find, that the French commander, apprehensive of our army in Portugal being reinforced, did practice every expedient, by collecting his whole force, marching out from his entrenchments, to bring the British troops as quickly as possible to an engagement. Yet, notwithstanding all his activity and address, he is completely beaten by one half of the British force. With this victorious army, in momentary expectation of considerable reinforcements, a large Portuguese army co-operating with us, in a country hostile to the enemy, almost to any extreme of vengeance, what was to be expected?—Surely, nothing short of unconditional capitulation. (*Hear! Hear! Hear!*) Did any man dream of any other result? (*Hear! Hear!*) Yet, the very next day after this brilliant victory, we learn that the British commander concluded an Armistice or preliminary treaty, by which the defeated French army was to be conveyed to France in British ships, there to be immediately forwarded to fight against the heroic Spaniards, engaged as they are in the most glorious of all causes, the emancipation of their native country from a vile and base usurpation. There is something still more extraordinary—our commanders gave manumission and pardon to all the traitors in Portugal. That is, we have marshalled in that country a *depôt* of French spies kept under British protection, and guaranteed by British faith. (*Hear! hear! hear!*) Why, instead of delivering Portugal, which was our object, from plunder and aggression, we have delivered the French army from destruction, in order to afford it fresh opportunities for enterprise and hostility.—(*Hear! hear!*). I have not mentioned the part of this disgraceful event, which went to affect the interests, nay, the safety of our Swedish ally. It is not upon an occurrence the most dark, mysterious and inscrutable that ever was hatched, that the people of England ought to remain inert. For my part, I never will by my silence become a foul participator in this act of disaster and disgrace. No; I contend

that this England regret, in they feel wherever should for my rever promised be sure, ration of of a petty inference kind of i What is tell you, generals acquit u frame th their par But, we the auth will be n Now, I Bourne, here, an amination mation, Inquiry, because lopement conduct this disg attributal to have, investiga argue, th promised that be s are dispo interfere throne b (*Hear!*)— prevent in a cert account, the since the duty invaluable (*Hear!*)— not to re London Answer. superiors no reason plain cou these gr joyful act proposed I endeavor opinion o in this fo



[725]

that this is the moment when the people of England ought to declare to the world, the regret, indignation, and mortification, which they feel at this ignominious event—that wherever the poison goes, the antidote should follow. (*Hear! hear! hear!*) But, my reverend friend tells us, that inquiry is promised positively. I deny it in toto: to be sure, there is in the Answer to the corporation of London, something in the shape of a petty composition, from which such an inference may be extracted; but even what kind of inquiry is that?—A due inquiry! What is a due inquiry? The ministers will tell you, one that does not affect us. The generals will answer, such a one as will acquit us.—(*A laugh.*) The people will frame their opinion of it, as it accords with their particular impressions on the subject. But, we have this day been apprised, from the authority of Mr. Sturges Bourne, that it will be not only a due, but a public inquiry. Now, I say, that if we had Mr. Sturges Bourne, or even my Lord Hawkesbury, here, and if, after examination and re-examination, we could extract no other information, I would not be satisfied. Courts of Inquiry, or Courts Martial, cannot satisfy, because they cannot embrace the development of all the causes or the conduct of all the persons to whom this disgraceful measure may probably be attributable. The country wants, and ought to have, a full, open, and parliamentary investigation. The opposers of the Address argue, that the inquiry which we seek is promised, and will certainly take place. If that be so, if we only ask what ministers are disposed to give, we do no harm by our interference, nor can our application to the throne be considered offensive.—(*Hear! Hear!*)—But, when I see this anxiety to prevent petitioning, and that there exists in a certain quarter such uneasiness on that account, my suspicions are aroused; I doubt the sincerity of the promise, and think it the duty of the people to exercise their invaluable and undoubted right.—(*Hear! Hear!*)—The people of this country ought not to remain inactive, because the city of London has petitioned and received an Answer. That great body may be far our superiors in a commercial view, but that is no reason for our acting similarly in our plain country way.—(*A laugh.*)—It is upon these grounds that I consider it the most joyful act of my life to support the Resolution proposed; because I conceive, by so doing, I endeavour to rescue my country, in the opinion of the world, from any participation in this foul transaction.

The Amendment, as proposed by the Rev. Mr. Poulter, was then read, amidst strong murmurs of disapproval, and was seconded by the Rev. Mr. Garnet; who considered the country bound by every tie of gratitude to an aged and venerable monarch, to await the fulfilment of his gracious promise for investigation.

The SHERIFF then put the question on the Amendment, as proposed by the Rev. Mr. Poulter, which was negatived unanimously, with the exception of about ten persons in that crowded assembly. The Resolution of Lord Northesk was then unanimously carried.

Mr. COBBETT.—“In pursuance of the Resolution now carried, I move, That the Address and Petition read by me, and now in the hands of the Deputy Sheriff, be the Address and Petition of this meeting.”

A desultory conversation then took place, in which it was considered a point of *etiquette* to receive the Address from the proposer of the Resolution.

Mr. COBBETT.—“I stand here in the exercise of a right, and cannot waive it upon a point of courtesy. I come here with my neighbours, the slaves of no party, and in order to afford to independent men an opportunity of asserting their opinion. In justice, therefore, I must persevere in pressing the motion which has been duly put.”

The Address of Lord Northesk was then read, as well as that of Mr. Cobbett; and the question was put, which of them the meeting would approve. On the first shew of hands, the numbers were so balanced, that the High Sheriff could not decide. It was then proposed, that they should go into the outer hall to be divided, and, accordingly, several departed. Some conversation took place between the two parties. It was proposed to Mr. Cobbett, by Lord Northesk's friends, to appoint a committee for the purpose of combining the two Addresses, or rather forming one out of the two; but Mr. Cobbett thought proper to decline all compromise. The Sheriff proposed that the vote should be taken upon the two Addresses by the holding up of hats. Those who remained in court, accordingly, held up their hats; when it was decided, that the majority were in favour of the following Address, as proposed by Lord Northesk, and seconded by Sir Thomas Miller:

“TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.—May it please your Majesty,  
—We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the nobility, gentlemen, clergy, freeholders, and other inhabitants, of the county of Southampton, beg



“ leave to approach your Majesty's throne,  
 “ with the sincerest assurances of our zealous attachment to your royal person and family; and knowing that your Majesty's true glory is inseparable from that of your people, we humbly beg leave to express our grief and regret at the Convention lately entered into by the commanders of your Majesty's forces in Portugal, and the commander of the French army in Lisbon; and further, humbly to submit to your Majesty our earnest and anxious prayer, that your Majesty will be graciously pleased to institute such full, public, and effectual Inquiry into this transaction, as will lead to the discovery of all those causes which have produced an event so injurious to the honour of this country, and the interest of the allies.”

After a motion of thanks to the High Sheriff for his upright and impartial conduct, the Meeting dissolved.—The evening concluded with dinners at the George and White Hart Inns.—Lord Northesk's friends dined at the former; Mr. Cobbett's at the latter.

#### MAJOR HOGAN'S APPEAL.

The demand for this Pamphlet continues to be such as might naturally be expected from the extraordinary nature of the case. It appears from the advertisement to the fifth edition, that no less than 5000 copies have been already disposed of. What an evidence of the public feeling, and of the interest which this production is calculated to excite! Several attacks have been published against Major Hogan, in consequence of his vigorous Appeal. But those attacks appear totally unworthy of attention; for it would be inconsistent with that gentleman's character and judgment, to notice what cannot make the slightest impression upon any man of common candour or common sense. To those who comment so particularly upon the final Letter, the publisher very properly observes, “ that that letter has no connection with the case of Major Hogan. The case, in fact, closes *before this letter is presented*; and it does not bear in any degree upon the grounds of that meritorious officer's complaint; which complaint rests entirely upon documents, the authenticity of which is quite unquestionable; namely, the letters of the Duke of York's Colonel Gordon.”

ERRATA in the last Register, p. 700.

In the last paragraph of Major Cartwright's Letter, read—*executive* sovereign; and, supreme *executive* power.

#### CITY OF LONDON.

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE KING'S ANSWER. (See the ANSWER at p. 646).

On Thursday, the 27th of October, the Common Council of London assembled to receive the Answer to their Address, on the subject of the Convention which terminated the campaign in Portugal. The Recorder having read the Answer:

Mr. WAITHMAN rose and addressed the court. He could, he said, not allow this Answer to pass without some observations, stating it at the same time to be his intention to propose such a Resolution founded upon it, as the nature of the case appeared to him to demand. He confessed that this was a subject of some delicacy, and it was probable he would hear several objections to the course he was pursuing from the gentleman opposite (Mr. S. Dixon), and others, who seemed much more anxious to avoid whatever might be disagreeable to the crown, than to guard the rights and privileges either of the democratical or aristocratical branches of our constitution. But the answer was constitutionally to be considered as that of his majesty's advisers, and as such he felt himself perfectly at liberty to comment upon it. He therefore thought it unnecessary to say any thing further on that point. With regard to the Answer itself, he certainly thought it a most extraordinary one. He conceived that the corporation of London had a right to approach the throne with petitions and remonstrances, even although his majesty might have expressed an intention of adopting such proceedings as they might recommend. It was proper that the king should be acquainted with the state of public opinion on all occasions, whether for or against the measures of the ministers, and it was the duty, as well as the privilege of the subject to give that information to the crown. It was the mode established by the constitution, for conveying the truth to the ear of the sovereign, in spite of the machinations of those around him who might wish to keep him in darkness. This was not a right conceded by the crown as a favour; but one required and demanded at the Revolution as essential to our civil liberties, and to be exercised without obstruction or censure. It appeared from the records of the court, that they had often gone up with petitions and remonstrances to the throne, drawn up in a style and spirit much less humble than their late Address, and yet the answers had not been of so repulsive a description. But the degrading reply which they had just heard read, they had drawn upon themselves;

and if i  
 upon th  
 not hav  
 years, a  
 momen  
 the in  
 court of  
 exercise  
 monstra  
 occasion  
 when th  
 hament  
 only dic  
 occasion  
 ever for  
 tive and  
 anxiety  
 the oth  
 “ The  
 was the  
 voices b  
 dence o  
 Occasio  
 remind  
 consiste  
 justice  
 previou  
 ble to  
 imagine  
 previou  
 It calle  
 punishin  
 ing to  
 That w  
 if no  
 there co  
 had mo  
 business  
 posed o  
 the cro  
 without  
 colleagu  
 unfortu  
 unneces  
 moved  
 disgrace  
 crown,  
 the cou  
 that be  
 gestures  
 Dixon)  
 the san  
 Address  
 we wer  
 religion  
 with an  
 posing  
 be over  
 dismiss  
 the pre  
 That ge



[729]

and if it had been merely a severe lecture upon their past conduct he owned he would not have been sorry. During the last 20 years, a period distinguished for the most momentous occurrences that ever called for the interposition of any body of men, the court of common council had scarcely ever exercised its right of petitioning or remonstrating, except some years ago on the occasion of the high price of provisions, when they petitioned for convening the parliament. But during all that time they not only did not omit, but eagerly sought for occasions of congratulation. They were ever forward to shew their zeal for prerogative and the rights of the crown; but no anxiety appeared to guard the privileges of the other branches of the constitution. "The glorious independence of the crown" was the constant cry; but when had their voices been raised for the glorious independence of the houses of lords and commons? Occasion was then taken in the answer, to remind the corporation, "that it was inconsistent with the principles of British justice to pronounce judgment without previous investigation." How it was possible to construe the Address, so as to imagine that it had pronounced judgment previous to investigation, he did not know. It called for inquiry certainly; it called for punishment on the guilty, without pretending to point out where the guilt rested. That was the matter to be investigated; and if no guilt was found, then, of course there could be no punishment. He himself had moved a petition for an inquiry into the business at the Helder; and this was opposed on the ground that the ministers of the crown would certainly institute one without any call from the court. A worthy colleague of his said, that the motion was unfortunately full of truths, but then it was unnecessary. Another member however moved a resolution, that the motion was a disgrace to the court, and an insult to the crown, and, incredible as it might appear, the court was so constituted at that time that he carried it. From the nods and gestures of the gentleman opposite (S. Dixon), he supposed he would have done the same thing with respect to the last Address, if he durst have done it. When we were told that the church and our holy religion were in danger, the court went up with an Address, although the danger, supposing there had been any, was known to be over, for his majesty had by that time dismissed his then ministers, and chosen the present "No Popery" administration. That gentleman had then no objection to go

up with what, according to his principles, might be called an unnecessary address, and yet he treated this subject with levity. How, in the present circumstances of the country, a matter of this importance could be so treated by a person in his senses, he was at a loss to conceive. When our arms by land were attended with such constant disasters, and these sometimes following victories, it was time to exercise our constitutional privileges of petitioning for inquiries with vigour and perseverance. But it was said, "that recent circumstances might have convinced us that his majesty was at all times ready to institute inquiries, on occasions in which the character of the country, or the honour of his arms were concerned; and that the interposition of the city of London was unnecessary." He supposed the allusion must be to general Whitelocke and sir H. Popham. But yet it was perfectly well known, that though the greatest attention and ingenuity had been shewn in squeezing money out of the pockets of the people, it was found almost impossible to prevent the embezzling of their property, or to get the offenders brought to justice. The strongest attempts had been made to prevent the bringing of lord Melville to trial; and the business of Alex. Davison had not as yet been publicly investigated. He had been told that ministers would institute an inquiry into the business at the Helder, but no investigation had taken place: and would they be more earnest to institute an inquiry into the causes of the Convention which they had announced as a victory, than into the business of the Helder, which had been allowed to be a great calamity? The situation of the army in Holland had been, according to the account of officers who were there, the most horrid that could well be imagined: men perishing in the snow, amidst plains where they could have no shelter, with other circumstances almost too shocking to describe. Yet no investigation had taken place into the causes of the evacuation of Holland. What need he mention the case of Quiberon, where arms for 28,000 had been delivered by us, and afterwards turned against ourselves? What need he mention the affair at Ferrol, where the inhabitants were seen coming out humbly with the keys by 18,000 men who had landed, as if to take a survey, but where the keys being taken for guns, the whole army was hastily embarked? No inquiry has been instituted into these disastrous events. Expensive expeditions were every now and then proposed, trusting to chance

for an object; and were the people who bore the expence to be obstructed and reproved for calling for investigation as to the mismanagement of these expeditions? Many other cases might be mentioned, if it were necessary. As to general Whitelocke, it was not to this day known who had procured his appointment. All that was known was that he had been appointed under one administration, and brought to trial by another. Sir H. Popham had been appointed by one, brought to trial by another, and after being reprimanded by a court-martial, was again taken into favour by a third. Lord Melville, to be sure, had been acquitted—very properly, no doubt—he could not now contest that—but, notwithstanding the very considerable minority against him, and the resolution on the journals of the house of commons, he was taken into favour at court, and had a considerable share in advising the measures of the present administration. If the same system were pursued in our army as in our navy, the same consequences would follow. The men were the same; the difference was only in the way of managing them. Sensible of the importance of promoting inquiries by every possible means, he could not but think the answer to the petition of the city of London very ill-judged, to say the least of it. He would therefore move the following RESOLUTION, viz.—

*Resolved.*—That his majesty's Answer be entered upon the Journals. That at the same time this court cannot forbear declaring it as their opinion, that the Address and Petition presented to his majesty by this court, on Wednesday, the 12th instant, was conceived in the most dutiful and respectful terms; that it is the undoubted right of the subject to petition, and that this right ought at all times to be freely exercised in all matters of public grievance without obstruction or reproach.—That they are, therefore, at a loss to know by what construction of their said Petition, however strained or perverted, his majesty's advisers could attribute to them any intention or desire 'to pronounce judgment without previous investigation.'—That they are equally at a loss to know why his majesty's advisers should have deemed it necessary to remind them, 'That it was inconsistent with the principles of British justice,' unless to throw an unmerited odium on this corporation, and raise a barrier between them and the crown, on all occasions where their object is free and constitutional inquiry.—That had this court refrained from expressing to his majesty their feelings at the humiliating termination of the campaign in Portugal, they must have ceased to feel—to think

—to act as Britons, and have shewn themselves unsusceptible of that patriotism so essentially necessary for the preservation of their liberties—the maintenance of their national honour—and the independence and security of his majesty's crown and dominions.—They cannot, therefore, sufficiently express their concern, that they should, by any suggestions, have met with obstruction and reprehension in the exercise of this undoubted and invaluable right.—That they particularly regret that his majesty should have been advised to express a hope, 'That recent occurrences would have convinced them, that his majesty is, at all times, ready to institute inquiries on occasions in which the character of the country, or the honour of his arms is concerned; and that the interposition of the city of London could not be necessary for inducing his majesty to direct due inquiry into a transaction, which had disappointed the hopes and expectations of the nation.'—Because it appears, that during the eventful period of the last 15 years, various enterprises and expeditions have been undertaken, 'in which the character of the country, and the honour of his majesty's arms were concerned,' which have grievously failed, and 'disappointed the hopes and expectations of the nation,' and into which 'due inquiry,' has not been made. That in one of the recent occurrences to which his majesty's Answer refers it is not known, even at the present moment, by whose advice the commander in chief was appointed, or on what account such commander was selected.—That during all these calamitous events, and wasteful profusion of blood and treasure, the public burthens have been patiently borne, and his majesty has not been called upon by 'the interposition of the city of London' (if their humble supplication must be so termed) to institute inquiries into these failures; although it appears to them that such 'interposition' might have been highly necessary and beneficial to the country, and by promoting 'due inquiry' precluded the necessity of their late application.—That during these unhappy reverses, and while his majesty's subjects submitted to so many privations, the most shameful and scandalous abuses and peculations have prevailed; into which 'due inquiry' has not been made so as to bring to justice such great public delinquents.—That whoever advised his majesty to put so unfavourable and unwarrantable a construction on their late Petition, has abused the confidence of his sovereign, and is equally an enemy to his majesty and the just rights of his people.—That they do not attribute guilt to any one, much less do they pronounce judgment with-

out previous investigation and the truth be found.

Mr. S. ought to be the usual person for entering and if a man observed all the the court was no was at an and required.

Mr. C. to the n prejudice. Of many approved much for appeared citizens and prot his power undoubted ministers the king of the pr given only was then he believ answer o delivered. the court one in a place of left the sorrow, cause for great and in present the answer three poin to him to In the fir that it wa of London the princ pronounced investigation every one tower shou posterity v council o sense. B opinion o tions in P pressed;



[33]

out previous investigation. They ask for investigation, prompt and rigid investigation, and the punishment of guilt wherever it may be found.

Mr. S. DIXON insisted, that the Answer ought to be entered separately, and asked the recorder, whether this was not the usual practice? The recorder replied, that it was the practice to propose the motion for entering the Answer separately first; and if any thing was intended to be added, to move it as an amendment.—Mr. Waithman observed, that he would contend against all the lawyers in Westminster Hall, that the court might do as it pleased, as there was no standing order on the point. This was at any rate an extraordinary occasion, and required an extraordinary proceeding.

Mr. QUIN said, that he offered himself to the notice of the court, divested of all prejudice either for or against ministers. Of many of their great foreign measures he approved; he was sorry he could not say so much for their domestic proceedings. He appeared simply as a representative of the citizens of London, to guard their honour and protect their privileges as far as lay in his power. The answer to the Address was undoubtedly to be regarded as that of the ministers, since, constitutionally speaking, the king could do no wrong. The sources of the prerogative were so pure, that it was given only for the good of the people. It was then the answer of the ministers, and he believed it might be considered as the answer of the noble lord, by whom it was delivered. That was a melancholy day for the court in one sense, but it was a glorious one in another. They had left their own place of meeting to tell the truth; they had left the advisers of the answer, not with sorrow, but disdain and contempt. The cause for which they had petitioned was great and noble. They had done their duty in presenting the address: the shame of the answer rested with others. There were three points in that answer, which appeared to him to call particularly for animadversion. In the first place, he should have thought that it was unnecessary to tell the corporation of London, "that it was inconsistent with the principles of the British constitution to pronounce judgment without previous investigation." This was a truism with which every one was acquainted; and if the answer should appear without the address, posterity would be apt to think the common council of this day destitute of common sense. But perhaps it was thought that the opinion of the corporation on the transactions in Portugal had been too strongly expressed; but could this be the case with re-

spect to an affair, which was stated in the concluding part of the answer itself, "to have disappointed the hopes and expectations of the nation?" The second point was the observation, that, "recent occurrences might have convinced the city, that his majesty was at all times ready to institute inquiries." An investigation had indeed taken place in the case of sir Robert Calder, whose old age had been rendered miserable by a sentence severe in any view of the matter; but most severe when contrasted with the easy escape of many others. Did the noble lord, who delivered the answer, recollect the transactions of the last fifteen years? Did he recollect the retreat at Dunkirk, and his own projected march to Paris? In looking at these events and their consequences, did it not appear necessary to call for inquiry? The royal duke at Dunkirk commanded 40,000 men. It was discovered at length that heavy artillery was wanted; and when this was sent, it was found that the balls did not suit the calibres. Why was there no inquiry into all this? When Holland was evacuated, the army had in December performed a march of ten weeks to Bremen—a thing in them equal to the retreat of the ten thousand; and all this while the royal duke was at head-quarters at a considerable distance. On another occasion, when an expedition was sent into Holland, it was found that the army wanted a commander, the royal duke being in London. The command was taken by one who had since gloriously fallen in his country's cause (Abercrombie) and success attended his course. The royal duke at length arrived: he had 50,000 men under his command; the conclusion was a capitulation, with a stipulation to deliver up 8000 French captives, and these their best seamen! Why was there no inquiry into this? Why was there no inquiry into the causes of the failure of Ferrol? Our soldiers were of the same character with our seamen; but the effects of their exertions were constantly liable to be tarnished by the mischievous system of secret courts of inquiry instead of open courts-martial. The third point was, "that the interposition of the city of London was unnecessary." What strange crime did the noble lord suppose the city to have committed by this interposition? Other places, however, in spite of his intended check, had chosen to partake in the guilt. Winchester had interposed—so had Westminster, Berkshire, &c. In 1621 the parliament remonstrated with James I.\* who had come from Scotland re-

\* See Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, Vol. I. p. 1338.



plete with despotic notions, about the system of policy which he pursued. The reply was, "that the parliament ought not to interpose in any prerogative matter, except the king was pleased to desire it." This prerogative extended to all points of the king's public duty. Such was the notion of the right of interposition under the Stuarts; and the noble lord who delivered the answer appeared to have taken his ideas on the subject from this source. The city of London, therefore, ought not to interpose unless his majesty was pleased to desire it! But it ought to be recollected, that these despotic principles drove the Stuarts from the throne. Had Magna Charta—had the Bill of Rights, and the other great documents securing our liberties, been forgotten? Had the noble lord looked at the first of William, where the right of petition was recognized? In Russia a regulation had once been made, that no petition was to be presented in the first instance, except to a minister. It was then to be presented to a second; and lastly, it might be presented to the sovereign himself, but it was at the peril of the life of the petitioner. Were we to be driven to this pass? In the reigns of Henry and Elizabeth, even while the constitution was floating between life and death, the answers were less insulting than that now read. Even Charles the first had treated the Remonstrance of the City of London with more respect. To keep the truth from the ear of the sovereign was the surest way to bring a government into contempt. This had lately been exemplified in the case of Spain. We ought to learn wisdom from experience. The ministers received flattery with smiles, but turned up their noses to the truth. It became the court, however, to have a due sense of its own dignity, and to act as became the representatives of the city of London, not with a view of pleasing any ministers, but with a single eye to the common weal. This, he hoped, it would do on the present occasion. The whole of the motion of his worthy friend had his hearty concurrence.

Mr. Dixon said, that no person could be more anxious than he was to support the dignity of that court, but, at the same time, he was anxious not to detract from the dignity of the crown, and the respect it was entitled to receive from every denomination of the subjects of these realms. The hon. gentleman who had just

sat down had informed the court, that their Addresses went in general to tell his majesty what he already well knew, namely, of the attachment of that court to his crown and dignity. The hon. gentleman, however, with all his declamation, had only told the court what they already knew, and what a boy at school deserved to be whipt if he did not know. The other gentleman had, as usual, been lavish of his abuse of him. He forgave him for it on this day, on every day past, and on every day to come; all he begged of that gentleman was, that he would never praise him! He contended, that it had been the invariable practice of that court, on every occasion when an Answer to an Address was received from his majesty, to move simply that—the answer be entered on the journals of the court; and if any declaration were meant to accompany the answer, then to move such resolution, as an addition or amendment to the original resolution. He read a case in point, to shew that this had been the practice. It was not his intention, at present, to enter into the merits of the resolution; without signifying either assent or disapprobation to the terms of that resolution, he should content himself with now moving, that the whole of the resolution after the word "that" be omitted for the purpose of inserting the words "that his majesty's most gracious Answer be entered on the journals of the court." After this resolution should have been agreed to, it would still be in the power of the hon. gentleman to follow it up with his present resolution, or any other which he might think proper to propose.

The Recorder here again read the original and amended resolutions. In doing so he by a lapsus described his majesty's answer as "grievous" instead of "gracious," and thereby occasioned considerable laughter in the court.

Mr. Alderman BIRCH appealed to the solid sense and good understanding of the court, and hoped they would not allow themselves, in the heat of the moment, to pass a resolution which they might afterwards look at with a considerable degree of regret. The resolution bore that it was the privilege of the court, and of the subjects of these kingdoms in general, to approach the throne without obstruction, and without reproof.

(To be continued.)